

REMARKS

Claims 5-9 and 12-14 are pending. Independent claim 11 has been canceled and the limitations incorporated into claim 12, which is now in independent form.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,731,633 to Clayton ("Clayton").

The Examiner relies upon Clayton's teachings of backward compatibility together with the description of the multi media card ("MMC") in the background of the present application, referred to as admitted prior art by the Examiner. However, it is respectfully asserted that Clayton, together with the background section of the present application does not teach all of the limitations of each of the pending claims, and does not render them obvious for the following reasons.

Clayton teaches an improved multichip semiconductor module compatible with existing single inline memory module ("SIMM") memory sockets in certain embodiments. Abstract. The preferred embodiments of Clayton are taught to be backward compatible with existing SIMM sockets. Col. 2., lines 4-6. The features taught by Clayton that appear to relate to the backward compatibility appear to be end holes 24 and corner notch 26. According to Clayton, "In the embodiment illustrated in FIG. 1, frame 12 is provided with two optional end holes 24 and a corner notch 26. These features are used for proper mating of the module to presently available SIMM sockets supplied by several connector manufacturers." Col. 5, lines 49-51. Another feature relating to backwards compatibility appears to be the use of flat contacts rather than leads for direct solder mounting using through hole or surface mount soldering technology. See Col. 8, lines 4-8.

Thus, whatever degree of backward compatibility this teaches between prior and presently available single inline memory modules does not relate to or teach the claim 5 limitations of "a first group of rectangularly shaped recesses formed in a row extending along one of said adjacent straight edges, said group containing electrical contacts at the bottom of the recesses, said group compatible with a first type of memory card receptacle; and a second group of one or more recesses containing one or more electrical contacts, said first and second group of

contacts together compatible with a second type of memory card receptacle." Nor does the disclosure of Clayton that "use of flat surface contact pads 22 located at the bottom edge of the molded frame 12 as shown in FIG. 1 is the preferred configuration of the is invention for backward compatibility with present SIMM sockets." Col. 8, lines 4-8.

Clayton further teaches that "other embodiments are compatible with other standards, such as the PCMCIA." Col. 2, lines 7-9. In the alternative PCMCIA embodiments, the contacts are at the edge of the shorter length, whereas in the preferred SIMM embodiment, the contacts are at the edge of greatest length. See Col. 6, lines 46-51.

In summary, Clayton teaches that different embodiments will have the contacts along different edges of the module. There is, however no teaching in Clayton of "... said [first] group containing electrical contacts at the bottom of the recesses, said [first] group compatible with a first type of memory card receptacle; and a second group of one or more recesses containing one or more electrical contacts, said first and second group of contacts together compatible with a second type of memory card receptacle." To the contrary, one of skill in the art would understand that the contacts of the preferred embodiment are compatible with only SIMM sockets, whereas the contacts of the alternative PCMCIA embodiments are compatible only with PCMCIA sockets. Again, the backwards compatibility mentioned in Clayton does not teach or relate to "... said [first] group containing electrical contacts at the bottom of the recesses, said [first] group compatible with a first type of memory card receptacle; and a second group of one or more recesses containing one or more electrical contacts, said first and second group of contacts together compatible with a second type of memory card receptacle," but instead relates to end holes 24 and corner notch 26, and the type of leads/contacts of the preferred SIMM embodiment.

Furthermore, Clayton has no mention of SD card standards or MMC card standards, as recited in certain of the claims. Therefore, Clayton does not, alone or in combination with the background of the present application, teach all of the limitations of claim 5 or otherwise render it obvious. As all of the other claims were rejected by the same rationale, it is also submitted that they are similarly allowable.

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance and an

early indication of its allowance is solicited. However, if the Examiner has any further matters that need to be resolved, a telephone call to the undersigned at 415-591-1584 would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

1/22/08
Date

P. Mikhail
Peter G. Mikhail, Reg. No. 46,930
on behalf of Johnny A. Kumar, Reg. No. 34,649

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
Customer No. 69735
(415) 591-1584